



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,850	04/30/2001	Milan Patel	NC29256	5624

26342 7590 07/14/2004

MILAN I. PATEL
NOKIA, INC.
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE
MD 1-4-755
IRVING, TX 75039

EXAMINER

TRINH, TAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2684

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,850

Applicant(s)

PATEL ET AL.

Examiner

TAN TRINH

Art Unit

2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-14, 21-23, 25, 27, 30-34, 43, 45-52, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raith (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,005).

Regarding claims 1, 21, 45 and 50, Raith teaches the method within an electronic device for adjusting a dialing sequence used for initiating a call in a wireless communication system (see figs. 3-4 and fig. 5, adjusting dialing mobile stations 540, 550 and 560), the electronic device operating in a region (see col. 2, lines 2-8), the method comprising the steps of: evaluating the dialing sequence to determine if the dialing sequence requires any adjustment (see col. 4, lines 59-63); determining a first code of the region based on current location of the electronic device (see fig. 3, col. 5, lines 28-37,), if determined that the dialing sequence requires any adjustment (see col. 5, lines 38-61 ; and adjusting the dialing sequence based on the first code of the region (see col. 5, 48-61).

Regarding claims 2 and 22, Raith teaches wherein the step of evaluating comprises a step of determining if the dialing sequence represents an emergency number (see col. 4, lines 59-66).

Regarding claims 3 and 23, Raith teaches wherein the step of adjusting comprises a step of using a current location emergency number associated with the first code of the region (see col. 5, lines 18-27), if determined that the dialing sequence represents an emergency number (see col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 3, and lines 59-65).

Regarding claims 5 and 25, Raith teaches wherein the step of determining if the dialing sequence represents an emergency number, comprises a step of determining if the dialing sequence is in a list of emergency numbers (see col. 5, lines 28-54).

Regarding claims 7 and 27, Raith teaches the step of determining a position of the electronic device (see col. 5, lines 62-67, col. 6, lines 18-21).

Regarding claim 8, Raith teaches the step of accessing a database to determine an area code associated with the determined position of the electronic device (see col. 6, lines 37-50).

Regarding claims 11, 30 and 31, Raith teaches the determining a location category based on the first code of the region and the step of setting the location category to an in

home region category, an in neighbor region category or an in roaming region (see fig. 3, col. 5, lines 27-36).

Regarding claims 12 and 32, Raith teaches the step of setting the location category to the In home region category, if the determine first code equals to a home area code assigned to the electronic device (see col. 5, lines 28-34).

Regarding claims 13 and 33, Raith teaches the step of setting the location category to the In neighbor region category, if the determine first code equals to a neighbor area code assigned to the electronic device (see col. 4, lines 62-67).

Regarding claims 14 and 34, Raith teaches the step of setting the location category to the In roaming region category, if the determine first code does not equals to a home area code assigned to the electronic device and a neighbor area code assigned to the electronic device 9see col. 5, lines 48-54).

Regarding claim 43, Raith teaches wherein the electronic device comprises a mobile terminal (see fig. 2).

Regarding claim 46, Raith teaches the step of determining a country code and retrieving the current location emergency number associated with the country code of the current region (see col. 5, lines 19-60).

Regarding claim 47, Raith teaches the step receiving a country code from a base station (see fig. 3, col. 5, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 48, Raith teaches the step calculating a position of the electronic device and using the position to determine the country code (see col. 5, line 62- col. 6 line 18 and lines 45-50).

Regarding claim 49, Raith teaches the step receiving the country code from an input device of the electronic device (see col. 5, lines 29-33).

Regarding claim 51, Raith teaches the step of determining a country code and retrieving the current location emergency number associated with the country code of the current region (see col. 5, lines 19-60).

Regarding claim 52, Raith teaches wherein the electronic device comprises a mobile terminal (see fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2684

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 6, 9-10, 15-20, 24, 26, 28-29, 35-42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Raith (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,005) in view of

Alexandria (U.S. patent No. 6, 067, 452).

Regarding claims 4 and 24, Raith fails to teach the first code comprises the step of accessing a database, the first code comprising a country code.

However, Alexandria teaches the first code comprises the step of accessing a database, the first code comprising a country code (see fig. 9, col. 5, lines 17-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Raith system by the teaching of Alexandria on the country code access thereto in order to provide initial dialing sequence on the international country easier.

Regarding claims 6 and 26, Raith fails to teach the first code of the region comprises the step of accessing a memory, the memory storing a base station area code and the step of setting the first code to the base station area code.

However, Alexandria teaches the first code of the region comprises the step of accessing a memory, the memory storing a base station area code and the step of setting the first code to the base station area code (see col. 5, lines 17-31).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Raith system by the teaching of Alexandria on the

area code access thereto in order to provide initial dialing sequence on outside area code easier.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 28-29, Raith fails to teach the step of evaluating the dialing sequence, comprises the step of determining if a length of the dialing sequence equals to a minimum length required by the region, the region associated with the first area code.

However, Alexandria teaches the step of evaluating the dialing sequence, comprises the step of determining if a length of the dialing sequence equals to a minimum length required by the region, the region associated with the first area code (see col. 5, lines 17-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Raith system by the teaching of Alexandria on the area code access thereto in order to provide initial dialing sequence on outside area code easier.

Regarding claims 15 and 35, Raith fails to teach the step of adding an area code to the dialing sequence, the area code provided by the user of the electronic device.

However, Alexandria teaches the step of adding an area code to the dialing sequence, the area code provided by the user of the electronic device (see fig. 9, col. 17-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Raith system by the teaching of Alexandria on the

area code access thereto in order to provide initial dialing sequence on outside area code easier.

Regarding claims 16 and 36, Alexandria teaches the step of prompting a user to provide the area code (see col. 5, lines 28-31).

Regarding claims 17 and 37, Alexandria teaches the step of prompting a user to select the area code from a plurality of area codes. (see fig. 9, col. 5, lines 24-28).

Regarding claims 18 and 38, Alexandria teaches wherein the step of prompting the user to select, and generating the plurality of area codes (see fig. 9, col. 5, lines 28-45).

Regarding claims 19 and 39, Raith fails to teach the step of adding a home area code to adjust the dialing sequence.

However, Alexander teaches the step of adding a home area code to adjust the dialing sequence (see col. 5, lines 14-19).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Raith system by the teaching of Alexander on the adding home area so that user can save the cost of out of area call.

Regarding claims 20 and 40, Raith fails to teach the step of adding a neighbor area code to adjust the dialing sequence.

However, Alexander teaches the step of adding a neighbor area code to adjust the dialing sequence (see col. 5, lines 33-45).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Raith system by the teaching of Alexander on the adding neighbor area so that user can make the call to the neighbor area easier.

Regarding claim 41, Raith fails to teach the processor further stores a home area code, a home country code and a list of neighboring area codes prior to initiating the call.

However, Alexander teaches the step of adding a neighbor area code to adjust the dialing sequence (see col. 5, lines 33-45).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Raith system by the teaching of Alexander to have stores a home area code, a home country code and a list of neighboring area codes prior to initiating the call easier.

Regarding claim 42, Raith fails to teach wherein the processor further receives base station information from a base station; the base station information comprises a base station country code and a base station area code, prior to initiating the call.

However, Alexander teaches the processor further receives base station information from a base station; the base station information comprises a base station country code and a base station area code, prior to initiating the call (see col. 5, lines 48-57).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Raith system by the teaching of Alexander to have the base station information comprises a base station country code and a base station area code, prior to initiating the call.

5. Claims 44 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raith (U.S. Patent No. 6,073,005) in view of Ausems (U.S. patent No. 6,434,403).

Regarding claims 44 and 53, Raith fails to teach the electronic device comprises a personal digital assistant.

However, Ausems teaches the electronic device comprises a personal digital assistant (see fig. 1A-O, col. 1, lines 54-57).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Raith system by the teaching of Ausems of the wireless phone and PDA are integrated in single device thereto in order to provide user with the convenient to carry around of one unit and exchange data is easier.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4-30-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

(i) Applicant's arguments the reference of Raith is not teach or reference to a code of the region. However the examiner does not agree. Since the reference of Raith teaches a code of the region or country (see figs. 3-4 and col. 5, lines 22-31).

Therefore the rejection of claims 1, 21, 45 and 50 are read a code of the region or country by reference of Raith.

(ii) Applicant's arguments the reference of Raith is not teach the adjusting of the dialing sequence by adding or subtracting a portion of the phone number according to the code of the region. However the examiner does not agree. Since the reference of Raith teaches the mobile uses the current country code to index the store data base of numbers and substitute the correct emergency number for e.g., 911, when the user has roamed to a different country or region having a different emergency number the mobile unit could simply store the broadcast number and replace the user's dialing sequence of home emergency number, the correct emergency is transmitted (the call is identified as an emergency call for subsequent processing change) (see col. 5, lines 40-61).

Therefore the rejection of claims 1, 21, 45 and 50 are read on the adjusting of the dialing sequence of Raith.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

*Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tan Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-5622.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung, can be reached at (703) 308-7745.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

Tan H. Trinh
Art Unit 2684
July 6, 2004


NICK CORSARO
PATENT EXAMINER